



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/623,186	07/21/2003	Thomas Martin Buckingham	NOES-0001-1	4727		
22506	7590	10/04/2006	EXAMINER			
JAGTIANI + GUTTAG 10363-A DEMOCRACY LANE FAIRFAX, VA 22030				FLETCHER III, WILLIAM P		
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				1762		
DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006						

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/623,186	BUCKINGHAM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	William P. Fletcher III	1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 26-49 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 41-49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 26-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/21/2003</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Per applicant's preliminary amendment, filed May 5, 2005, claims 26-49 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

2. Claim 42 should have been included in Group II in the restriction requirement mailed June 19, 2006. The examiner apologizes for the inconvenience.
3. Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on July 18, 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
4. Claims 41-49 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on July 18, 2006.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on July 21, 2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

6. The drawings were received on July 21, 2003. These drawings are acceptable.

Specification

7. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: METHOD OF ILLUMINATING A ROTARY BLADE BY APPLICATION OF A PHOTOLUMINESCENT PAINT.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. Claim 36 recites "wherein said topcoat sealer comprises high solids and a urethane coating," which appears to define the composition of the topcoat. Yet claim 36 recites that the topcoat contains at least one polyester resin. It is unclear whether the topcoat contains both urethane and polyester or whether the topcoat contains urethane or polyester.

B. Claim 39 is similarly indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 26, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gouterman et al. (US 5,186,046 A).

A. This reference teaches a process comprising the application of a photoluminescent paint to a reflective white paint- (i.e., primer-) coated rotor blade [7:12-15, 31-33, 44-45, 54-58; and 8:3-20].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. **Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gouterman et al.**

- A. Gouterman is applied herein again as detailed above.
- B. This reference does not disclose the application of a sealer coat.
- C. It is the examiner's position that such would have been obvious to protect the underlying luminescent coating.

15. Claims 28, 29, 30, and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gouterman et al., as applied to claims 26, 27, and 32, further in view of Barney et al. (US 2002/0110180 A1).

- A. Gouterman is applied herein again as detailed above.
- B. This reference fails to teach the particular composition recited in these claims.
- C. Barney teaches a photoluminescent composition having a polyurethane binder [0032].
- D. Because Gouterman is not particularly limited to the type of binder, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process of Gouterman so as to utilize, as the polymeric binder, a urethane. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so by the desire and expectation of successfully providing a photoluminescent coating on the surface.
- E. With respect to claims 33-37, as noted above, application of a sealer coat would have been obvious to protect the underlying luminescent coating.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Burns, S., and Sullivan, J., "The Use of Pressure Sensitive Paint on Rotating Machinery," CH34827-95, IEEE 16th International Congress on Instrumentation in Aerospace Simulation Facilities (ICIASF), Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, 1995, pp. 32.1-14, is representative of the state of the art.
17. The prompt development of clear issues in the prosecution history requires that applicant's reply to this Office action be fully responsive (MPEP § 714.02). When filing an amendment, applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including new or amended claims (MPEP §§ 714.02 & 2163). A fully responsive reply to this Office action, if it includes new or amended claims, must therefore include an explicit citation (i.e., page number and line number) of that/those portion(s) of the original disclosure which applicant contends support(s) the new or amended limitation(s).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Fletcher III whose telephone number is (571) 272-1419. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 0900h-1700h.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



William Phillip Fletcher III
Patent Examiner (FSA), USPTO
Art Unit 1762

Fredericksburg, VA
September 28, 2006